



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/035,346

12/28/2001

John de Q. Walker

01-152

1045

24319

7590

04/17/2003

LSI LOGIC CORPORATION
1621 BARBER LANE
MS D-106, LEGAL DEPARTMENT
MILPITAS, CA 95035

EXAMINER

NADAV, ORI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2811

DATE MAILED: 04/17/2003

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/035,346	Applicant(s) WALKER ET AL.	
	Examiner ori nadav	Art Unit 2811	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2811

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-2 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stover et al. (3,914,708).

Regarding claims 1-2, Stover et al. teach in figure 2a and related text a varactor comprising: a diode junction 26/12; a depletion region (see figure 3) adjacent to the diode junction; and a doped region 12 (see figure 1c) including the depletion region and having a nonuniform dopant concentration profile that increases with increasing depth of the doped region from the diode junction 32, 46 (see figure 3); and wherein the nonuniform dopant concentration profile causes the varactor to have an approximately linear capacitance/voltage response characteristic (see figures 4a and 4b and column 6, lines 7-8), wherein: the doped region includes a peak dopant concentration region 34, 47 outside the depletion region (see figure 3); and the peak dopant concentration region forms a conductive path to and from the varactor.

Art Unit: 2811

Regarding claims 8-10, Stover et al. teach in figure 2a and related text a semiconductor substrate; a first side 10, 12 of the varactor formed in the semiconductor substrate and being doped with a first type of dopant in a retrograde dopant profile (see figure 3); a second side 26 of the varactor formed in the semiconductor substrate adjacent the first side and being doped with a second type of dopant; and a portion of the first side adjacent the second side forming a depletion region (see figure 3) within the first side upon applying a voltage bias between the first side and second side, the dopant profile in the first side creating a capacitance between the first side and the second side that is linearly variable in response to differing magnitudes of the applied voltage bias (see figures 4a and 4b and column 6, lines 7-8), wherein: the retrograde profile of the first type of dopant in the first side includes an increasing dopant concentration 32, 46 with increasing depth from the second side to a peak concentration region 34, 47; and the peak concentration region functions as a conductive path to and from the varactor, and wherein the first side is a generally horizontal bottom side; and the second side is a top side generally parallel to the bottom side.

Art Unit: 2811

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stover et al. in view of Sze.

Regarding claims 3-5, Stover et al. teach substantially the entire claimed structure, as applied to claim 1 above, except stating that the nonuniform dopant concentration profile is defined by an equation $N=Bx\exp(m)$, where N is the dopant concentration, x is the depth of the doped region, B is a concentration constant and m is an exponent that determines the degree of curvature of the dopant profile, wherein m is about 3.

Sze teaches that a nonuniform dopant concentration profile is defined by the equation $N=Bx\exp(m)$, where N is the dopant concentration, x is the depth of the doped region, B is a concentration constant and m is an exponent that determines the degree of curvature of the dopant profile, wherein m is greater than zero.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a nonuniform dopant concentration profile defined by the equation $N=Bx\exp(m)$, where N is the dopant concentration, x is the depth of the doped region, B is a concentration constant and m is an exponent that determines the degree of curvature of the dopant profile, wherein m is about 3 in Stover et al.'s device,

Art Unit: 2811

because the above equation is known to define a nonuniform dopant concentration profile, and in order to provide the closest characteristics to those of an ideal varactor, respectively.

Regarding claims 6-7, Stover et al. teach in figure 3 that B is in the range from about $1.0 \times 10^{13}/\text{cm}^3$ to about $1.0 \times 10^{19}/\text{cm}^3$, and about $1.0 \times 10^{16}/\text{cm}^3$.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant argues that Stover et al. do not teach an increasing nonuniform dopant concentration profile to obtain a linear response, as required by claim 1.

Claim 1 recites a doped region having a nonuniform dopant concentration profile that increases with increasing depth of the doped region. Claim 1 further recites a nonuniform dopant concentration profile causes the varactor to have an approximately linear capacitance/voltage response characteristic. Stover et al. teach in figure 2a and related text a doped region 12 (see figure 1c) including the depletion region and having a nonuniform dopant concentration profile that increases with increasing depth of the doped region from the diode junction 32, 46 (see figure 3); and wherein the nonuniform dopant concentration profile causes the varactor to have an approximately linear capacitance/voltage response characteristic (see figures 4a and 4b and column 6, lines 7-8),

Art Unit: 2811

6. Applicant argues that Stover et al. do not teach a second side 26 formed in the semiconductor substrate but rather on the first side.

The whole semiconductor block 10, 12 wherein the varactor is formed is taken as the semiconductor substrate. Therefore, the second side 26 is formed in the semiconductor substrate, as claimed.

7. Applicant argues that Stover et al. do not teach creating a capacitance between the first side and the second side that is linearly variable with the voltage bias, because Stover et al.'s figures depict a reversed "S" type shape.

Although Stover et al.'s figures depict a reversed "S" type shape, the middle of the curve is linear. Therefore, Stover et al. teach creating a capacitance between the first side and the second side that is linearly variable in response to differing magnitudes of the applied voltage bias, as claimed.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2811

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology center (TC) 2800 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to TC 2800 via the TC 2800 Fax center located in Crystal Plaza 4, room 4-C23. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 2811 Fax Center number is (703) 308-7722 and 308-7724. The Group 2811 Fax Center is to be used only for papers related to Group 2811 applications.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or any earlier communication from the Examiner should be directed to *Examiner Nadav* whose telephone number is **(703) 308-8138**. The Examiner is in the Office generally between the hours of 7 AM to 4 PM (Eastern Standard Time) Monday through Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by

Art Unit: 2811

telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Thomas, can be reached at **(703) 308-2772**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **Technology Center Receptionists** whose telephone number is **308-0956**



O.N.
April 15, 2003

ORI NADAV
PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800